



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

JIGJR: 07-06

Paper No: ____

BRIAN E. HANLON
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1001 G STREET NW
ELEVENTH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

COPY MAILED

JUL 10 2006

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Schroeder
Application No.: 09/819,040
Filing Date: 23 April, 2001
Attorney Docket No. 006366.0080

:
:
:
:
:

DECISION

This is a decision on the petition filed on 12 May, 2004, to withdraw the holding of abandonment and considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.181; alternatively, on the 6 June, 2006, petition, which seeks to revive the application alleging unintentional delay—albeit sketchily—and is considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).¹

NOTES:

The Change of Correspondence Address and Revocation/Power of Attorney presented with the instant petition has not been entered because, at this writing, Petitioner must include a certificate under 37 C.F.R. §3.73(b) to support the authority.

Thus, while a copy of the instant decision is being sent to Petitioner as a courtesy, no change has been made as of this writing in Office records, and Petitioner must satisfy these requirements to effectuate the change.

¹ Petitioner is directed to the petition form on the Office website—www.uspto.gov—and should Petitioner insist upon using his own form, Petitioner is reminded that it must have at least the content of the Office form, and in particular as to the wording of the statement of unintentional delay.

For the reasons set forth below the petition as considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 is **DISMISSED**; and the petition considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **DISMISSED**.

NOTES:

- (1) Any petition (and fee) for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within two (2) months from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted.

(It is noted, however, that Petitioner may be unable to present a satisfactory showing to support a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181, and Petitioner's only alternative is to file a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).)

- (2) Thereafter, there will be no further reconsideration of this matter.

BACKGROUND

The record reflects that:

- then-Petitioner/Counsel Brian E. Hanlon (Reg. No. 40,449) failed to reply timely and properly to a non-final Office action mailed on 15 May, 2003 (the May 2003 Office action), with reply due absent extension of time on or before 15 August, 2003;²
- the instant application went abandoned after midnight 15 August, 2003;
- the Office mailed the Notice of Abandonment on 16 December, 2003;³
- on 12 May, 2004, then-Petitioner/Counsel submitted a request (the May 2004 request) to withdraw the holding of abandonment nine (9) months after abandonment and five (5) months after Notice thereof, and therein then-Petitioner/Counsel averred that the Office had failed to enter the Revocation/Power of Attorney filed on 10 October, 2001—as

² A copy of this paper is enclosed herewith in order that Petitioner may reply properly in support of a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137.

³ A copy of this paper also is enclosed herewith.

indicated by a date-stamped receipt card (see: MPEP §503⁴)—and so the May 2003 Office action was mailed to an incorrect address, as was the Notice of Abandonment;

- what then-Petitioner/Counsel failed to acknowledge was that: (a) the Revocation/Power of Attorney was an incomplete submission in that it was not accompanied, *inter alia*, by a certificate under 37 C.F.R. §3.73(b); and (b) then-Petitioner/Counsel had made absolutely no inquiry into the Status of the instant application in the twenty-nine (29) months between the date of his deposit of the Revocation/Power of Attorney and the filing of the May 2004 request;⁵
- there is a suggestion that then-Petitioner/Counsel sought to submit a Status inquiry on 28 October, 2004,⁶ however, there is no copy of a date-stamped receipt card evidencing Office receipt thereof;

⁴ MPEP §503 provides in pertinent part:
§503 Application Number and Filing Receipt

A return postcard should be attached to *each* patent application for which a receipt is desired. It is important that the return postcard itemize all of the components of the application. If the postcard does not itemize each of the components of the application, it will not serve as evidence that any component which was not itemized was received by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). It should be recognized that the identification of an application by application number does not necessarily signify that the USPTO has accepted the application as complete (37 C.F.R. §1.53(a)).

RETURN POSTCARD

If a receipt of any item (e.g., paper or fee) filed in the USPTO is desired, it may be obtained by enclosing with the paper a self-addressed postcard specifically identifying the item. The USPTO will stamp the receipt date on the postcard and place it in the outgoing mail. A postcard receipt which itemizes and properly identifies the items which are being filed serves as *prima facie* evidence of receipt in the USPTO of all the items listed thereon on the date stamped thereon by the USPTO.

The identifying data on the postcard should be so complete as to clearly identify the item for which receipt is requested. For example, the postcard should identify the applicant's name, application number (if known), confirmation number (if known), filing date, interference number, title of the invention, etc. The postcard should also identify the type of paper being filed, e.g., new application, affidavit, amendment, notice of appeal, appeal brief, drawings, fees, motions, supplemental oath or declaration, petition, etc., and the number of pages being submitted. If a new application is being filed, all parts of the application being submitted should be separately listed on the postcard, e.g., the number of pages of specification (including written description, claims and abstract), number of claims, number of sheets of drawings, number of pages of oath/declaration, number of pages of cover sheet (provisional application).

The postcard receipt will not serve as *prima facie* evidence of receipt of any item which is not adequately itemized on the postcard. For example, merely listing on the postcard "a complete application" or "patent application" will not serve as a proper receipt for each of the required components of an application (e.g., specification (including claims), drawings (if necessary), oath or declaration and the application filing fee) or missing portions (e.g., pages, sheets of drawings) of an application if one of the components or portion of a component is found to be missing by the USPTO. Each separate component should be specifically and properly itemized on the postcard. Furthermore, merely incorporating by reference in the postcard receipt, the items listed in a transmittal letter will not serve as *prima facie* evidence of receipt of those items.

The person receiving the item(s) in the USPTO will check the listing on the postcard against the item(s) being filed to be sure they are properly identified and that all the items listed on the postcard are presently being submitted to the USPTO. If any of the items listed on the postcard are not being submitted to the USPTO, those items will be crossed off and the post-card initialed by the person receiving the items. Upon return of a postcard receipt from the USPTO, the postcard receipt should be promptly reviewed by the person who filed the items to ensure that every item specifically denoted on the postcard was received by the USPTO. If the postcard receipt has been annotated to indicate that a particular item denoted on the postcard was not received by the USPTO, the postcard receipt will not serve as *prima facie* evidence of receipt of that item in the USPTO. (Emphasis supplied.)

⁵ It is noted that then-Petitioner/Counsel filed an Application Data Sheet (ADS) on 28 January, 2004.

⁶ This information comes by way of and a copy of the document is attached to the 6 June, 2006, petition.

- on 6 June, 2006, Petitioner/Counsel Stefan V. Stein (Reg. No. 29,702) submitted the most recent petition—alleging, *inter alia*, unintentional delay—and also re-asserted the request to withdraw the holding of abandonment.

Indeed, the Office apparently did not enter in 2001 a revocation/power of attorney, however, as noted above, the request was incomplete and—other than submit an ADS—then-Petitioner/Counsel appears to have taken no action in the matter between October 2001 and May 2004—thus ignoring what now is alleged to have been Office error and never bringing the matter to the attention of the Office.

The showing that then-Petitioner/Counsel had to make was and is set out in the commentary at MPEP §711.03(c) and the regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.181—specifically the timing requirements.

Thus, then-Petitioner/Counsel ignored not only the facts but also the procedure applicable herein.

As a result, if Petitioner now has undertaken the instant matter, he can have no more than what was present before he came into the matter—and his only recourse may well be to obtain revival of the application under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

However, even there Petitioner faces certain hurdles. The chain of assignments (and so, chain of title) is unclear, and so the assignee's—and Petitioner's—authority must be clarified from the inventor to the first assignee to subsequent assignee(s). Moreover, Petitioner was not of record at the time the instant application went abandoned, and, accordingly, any statement of unintentional delay must be made by then-Counsel or the inventor/assignee(s) who held title at the time in question.

Out of an abundance of caution, Petitioners always are reminded that the filing of a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 does not toll any periods that may be running any action by the Office and a petition seeking relief under the regulation must be filed within two (2) months of the act complained of (see: 37 C.F.R. §1.181(f)), and those registered to practice *and* all others who make representations before the Office are reminded to inquire into the underlying facts of representations made to the Office and support averments with the appropriate documentation—since all owe to the Office the continuing duty to disclose.⁷

⁷ See supplement of 17 June, 1999. The Patent and Trademark Office is relying on petitioner's duty of candor and good faith and accepting a statement made by Petitioner. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing statements to the Patent and Trademark Office).

Specifically, the regulations at 37 C.F.R. §10.18 provide:

§ 10.18 Signature and certificate for correspondence filed in the Patent and Trademark Office.

(a) For all documents filed in the Office in patent, trademark, and other non-patent matters, except for correspondence that is required to be signed by the applicant or party, each piece of correspondence filed by a practitioner in the Patent and Trademark Office must bear a signature by such practitioner complying with the provisions of §1.4(d), §1.4(e), or § 2.193(c)(1) of this chapter.

Monitoring of the status of applications on Private PAIR can inform one's management of application responses and provide an indication when mailings of Office actions should be expected.

Then-Petitioner/Counsel ignored the requirement that the petition herein be filed within two months of the action complained of. (See: 37 C.F.R. §1.181.).

Accordingly, then-Petitioner/Counsel ignored one or more of the showings required to prevail.

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).⁸

(b) By presenting to the Office (whether by signing, filing, submitting, or later advocating) any paper, the party presenting such paper, whether a practitioner or non-practitioner, is certifying that—

(1) All statements made therein of the party's own knowledge are true, all statements made therein on information and belief are believed to be true, and all statements made therein are made with the knowledge that whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of the Patent and Trademark Office, knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be subject to the penalties set forth under 18 U.S.C. 1001, and that violations of this paragraph may jeopardize the validity of the application or document, or the validity or enforceability of any patent, trademark registration, or certificate resulting therefrom; and

(2) To the best of the party's knowledge, information and belief, formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances, that —

(i) The paper is not being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass someone or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of prosecution before the Office;

(ii) The claims and other legal contentions therein are warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law or the establishment of new law;

(iii) The allegations and other factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and

(iv) The denials of factual contentions are warranted on the evidence, or if specifically so identified, are reasonably based on a lack of information or belief.

(c) Violations of paragraph (b)(1) of this section by a practitioner or non-practitioner may jeopardize the validity of the application or document, or the validity or enforceability of any patent, trademark registration, or certificate resulting therefrom. Violations of any of paragraphs (b)(2)(i) through (iv) of this section are, after notice and reasonable opportunity to respond, subject to such sanctions as deemed appropriate by the Commissioner, or the Commissioner's designee, which may include, but are not limited to, any combination of —

(1) Holding certain facts to have been established;

(2) Returning papers;

(3) Precluding a party from filing a paper, or presenting or contesting an issue;

(4) Imposing a monetary sanction;

(5) Requiring a terminal disclaimer for the period of the delay; or

(6) Terminating the proceedings in the Patent and Trademark Office.

(d) Any practitioner violating the provisions of this section may also be subject to disciplinary action. See § 10.23(c)(15).

[Added 50 FR 5175, Feb. 6, 1985, effective Mar. 8, 1985; para. (a) revised, 58 FR 54494, Oct. 22, 1993, effective Nov. 22, 1993; paras. (a) & (b) revised, paras. (c) & (d) added, 62 FR 53131, Oct. 10, 1997, effective Dec. 1, 1997; para. (a) revised, 69 FR 56481, Sept. 21, 2004, effective Oct. 21, 2004]

⁸ 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.⁹

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.¹⁰ Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).¹¹

And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.¹² Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.¹³))

Withdrawal of the Holding of Abandonment

The courts have determined the construct for properly supporting a petition seeking withdrawal of a holding of abandonment.¹⁴

Further, the commentary at MPEP §711.03(c) provides:

the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

⁹ Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

¹⁰ See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, Final Rule Notice*, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

¹¹ See: *In re Application of G*, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

¹² See: *Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment*, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office *supra*.

¹³ Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

¹⁴ See: *Delgar v. Schulver*, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971).

* * *

A. Petition To Withdraw Holding of Abandonment Based on Failure To Receive Office Action

In *Delgar v. Schulyer*, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), the court decided that the Office should mail a new Notice of Allowance in view of the evidence presented in support of the contention that the applicant's representative did not receive the original Notice of Allowance. Under the reasoning of *Delgar*, an allegation that an Office action was never received may be considered in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment. If adequately supported, the Office may grant the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment and remail the Office action. That is, the reasoning of *Delgar* is applicable regardless of whether an application is held abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee (35 U.S.C. 151) or for failure to prosecute (35 U.S.C. 133). To minimize costs and burdens to practitioners and the Office, the Office has modified the showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office action. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner stating that the Office communication was not received by the practitioner and attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office communication was not received. A copy of the docket record where the nonreceived Office communication would have been entered had it been received and docketed must be attached to and referenced in practitioner's statement. For example, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action.

* * *

The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the Office action may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the Office action was lost in the mail (e.g., if the practitioner has a history of not receiving Office actions).

Evidence of nonreceipt of an Office communication or action (e.g., Notice of Abandonment or an advisory action) other than that action to which reply was required to avoid abandonment would not warrant withdrawal of the holding of abandonment. Abandonment takes place by operation of law for failure to reply to an Office action or timely pay the issue fee, not by operation of the mailing of a Notice of Abandonment. See *Lorenz v. Finkl*, 333 F.2d 885, 889-90, 142 USPQ 26, 29-30 (CCPA 1964); *Krahn v. Commissioner*, 15 USPQ2d 1823, 1824 (E.D. Va 1990); *In re Application of Fischer*, 6 USPQ2d 1573, 1574 (Comm'r Pat.

1988). (Emphasis supplied.)

* * *

And the regulation requires that relief be sought within two (2) months of the act complained of.

Thus, as of this writing Petitioner appears not to have satisfied and not to be able to satisfy the showing and/or the timeliness requirements described above.

As to the Allegations
of Unintentional Delay

The requirements for a grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee, a statement/showing of unintentional delay, a proper reply, and—where appropriate—a terminal disclaimer and fee.

As of this writing Petitioner has not satisfied the “reply,” “fee” and “showing/statement” requirements of the regulation.

CONCLUSION

Because it appears that Petitioner has not satisfied the burdens set forth in Delgar v. Schulyer, the petition as considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 hereby is dismissed; and the petition as considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is dismissed.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:¹⁵

By mail: Commissioner for Patents¹⁶
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX: IFW Formal Filings
(571) 273-8300
ATTN.: Office of Petitions

¹⁵ On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number changed to (571) 273-8300. The old FAX number no longer is in service and (571) 273-8300 will be the only facsimile number recognized for centralized delivery. (For further information, see: <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/cfax062005.pdf>.)

¹⁶ To determine the appropriate addresses for other subject-specific correspondence, refer to the USPTO Web site at www.uspto.gov.

Application No.: 09/819,040

9

By hand: Mail Stop: Petition
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214.



John D. Gillon, Jr.
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

Encl: 15 May, 2003, Non-final Office Action
16 December, 2003, Notice of Abandonment

cc:
STEFAN V. STEIN
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
P.O. BOX 1288
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33601-1288